

## **REMARKS**

Claims 1-3 and 7-24 are pending in the application.

The Examiner rejects claims 1-3, 7-24 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by **Zhou**. The Examiner asserts that **Zhou**, at col. 9, line 8 through col. 10, line 51, teaches the features of claim 1. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection. Among other things, claim 1 calls for using an analog-to-digital (A/D) converter for processing voice signals. Claim 1 further calls for converting a portion of a ringing signal received from the subscriber line to a digital signal using the same A/D converter that is used for voice signals. In other words, claim 1 calls for employing a common analog-to-digital (A/D) converter for the purposes of processing voice signal and ringing signal. The patent specification, for example, describes one embodiment in which the A/D converter 305 of Figure 2 may be utilized for the various specified purposes. **Zhou** at least does not teach using an A/D converter for the purposes of processing voice signals and ringing.

The Examiner asserts that **Zhou**, at col. 9, line 8 through col. 10, line 51, teaches the features of converting the ringing signal received from the subscriber line using the same A/D converter, namely converter 506 of **Zhou**, that converts the voice signals. The Applicants respectfully disagree. **Zhou** discloses converters 504 that interface between the XASLICs 504 and the digital signal processor 509. **Zhou**, 7:33-37. Further, **Zhou** describes that these converters 504 process voice signals. *See* **Zhou**, 7:37-50 (stating that the voice signals from the SASLICs 504 are processed by the converters 504). However, contrary to the Examiner's assertion, **Zhou** does not describe that these converters 504 also the ringing signal portion received from the subscriber line. There is simply no such disclosure in **Zhou**. While this reference does disclose, at 7:18-22, that XASLICs 504 receive analog data signal, such as

ringing signals, from the converters 506, this description refers to receiving the ringing signal from the converters 506, whereas claim 1 specifies receiving the ringing signal from the subscriber line. Thus, this passage in Zhou describes the flow in the opposite direction of that claimed.

Claim 1 also calls for receiving a control signal and transmitting a ringing signal to a subscriber line in response to the control signal. Thus, based on the plain language of the claim, the “ringing” signal transmitted to the subscriber line is different from the “control” signal that is received. Indeed, the claim specifies that the “ringing” signal is transmitted in response to the “control” signal. The Examiner argues that *Zhou* discloses at col. 7, lines 10-24 the claimed feature of receiving control signal, and discloses the claimed feature of transmitting the ringing signal at col. 7, lines 24-32. *See* Office Action, p. 3. The passages cited by the Examiner describe that XASLICs 504 receive data signals, such as ringing signals, from the converters 506 and that these “data signals are superimposed upon a DC bias voltage determined by the DC feed control signal and transmitted over a subscriber loop.” In other words, *Zhou* describes that the received ringing signals are themselves superimposed and transmitted to a subscriber loop. That is, under the Examiner’s application of Zhou, there is no ringing control signal that is different from the ringing signals themselves. In contrast, claim 1 calls for receiving a ringing control signal, and then transmitting a ringing signal (not the control signal) to the subscriber line in response to the control signal. To the extent “ringing” signal described at col. 7, lines 18-24 corresponds to the “control signal,” Zhou fails to disclose a “ringing” signal that is transmitted in response to the control signal. To the extent the received signal corresponds to the ringing signal that is transmitted to the subscriber line, Zhou fails to disclose a “control” signal.

In light of one or more of the reasons presented above, Applicant respectfully asserts that claim 1 and its dependent claims are allowable. For similar reasons, claims 7, 13 and 18 (and any claims depending therefrom) are also allowable.

The Office Action suffers from other shortcomings. For example, the Examiner rejects claim 19 for the same reasons as claim 1. However, claim 19 recites different features from claim 1, and the Examiner has not established a prima facie case of anticipation with respect to claim 19 and its dependent claims. For example, claim 19 calls for processing a signal received over a subscriber line by one or more components in a first path, the first path having an input terminal and an output terminal; receiving a control signal; coupling the input and the output terminal of the first path in response to receiving the control signal; and providing a ringing signal to the subscriber line responsive to the control signal. The Examiner fails to identify the path and the input and output terminals that are coupled in response to the control signal. Similarly, the Examiner's rejection falls short with respect to claim 22. For at least this reason, claims 19 and 22 (and any claims depending therefrom) are allowable.

In light of the reasons presented above, a Notice of Allowance is respectfully solicited.

If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at the Houston, Texas telephone number (713) 934-4064 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

WILLIAMS, MORGAN & AMERSON, P.C.  
CUSTOMER NO. 23720

Date: December 18, 2007

By: /R. S. Bains/  
Ruben S. Bains, Reg. No. 46,532  
10333 Richmond, Suite 1100  
Houston, Texas 77042

(713) 934-4064  
(713) 934-7011 (facsimile)  
ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANT(S)